

Revised Conditions for MRI due to Corotation Theorem

Francesco Cianfrani*

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Wrocław,
Plac Maksa Borna 9, PL-50-204 Wrocław, Poland.*

Giovanni Montani†

*ENEA, FSN-FUSPHY-TSM, R.C. Frascati, Via E. Fermi 45, 00044 Frascati, Italy
Physics Department, “Sapienza” University of Rome, P.le Aldo Moro 5, 00185 (Roma), Italy.*

We re-analyze the physical conditions for Magneto-rotational Instability (MRI) within a steady axisymmetric stratified disk of plasma, in order to account for the so-called corotation theory (the differential angular velocity depends on the magnetic flux surface). We develop the study of linear stability around an astrophysical background configuration, following the original derivation in [15], but implementing the corotation condition as the orthogonality between the background magnetic field and the angular velocity gradient. We demonstrate that a dependence on the background magnetic field direction is restored in the dispersion relation and, hence, the emergence of MRI is affected too.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BASIC FORMALISM

The existence of an Alfvénic instability in weakly magnetized rotating plasmas was discovered in 1959 by E. P. Velikhov [1] and implemented on an astrophysical setting by S. Chandrasekar in 1960 [2] and it is well-known as Magneto-Rotational Instability (MRI).

The intrinsic nature of such unstable mode profile consists of the coupling between Alfvén waves and the plasma inhomogeneity, due to differential rotation (indeed MRI is suppressed in uniformly rotating systems). The most intriguing feature of MRI is however that it vanishes when the magnetic field has sufficiently high amplitude, because of the effect of the restoring force due to magnetic tension, which is able to stabilize the plasma shift dynamics.

Despite an instability driven by magnetic tension does not transport matter, nonetheless MRI is very relevant for astrophysical systems and, in particular, for accretion structures.

The Shakura idea for accretion [3, 4] relies on the existence of an effective viscosity, emerging from the plasma turbulence and the differential rotation of the accretion profile. Actually MRI turns out to be the most appropriate (if not the only reliable) mechanism to rise such a turbulent regime in astrophysical accreting systems [5, 6] (see also [7], where MRI was re-analyzed, after the original derivation). The great impact of this issue can be easily understood when realizing that most of the space plasma are in the condition of weakly magnetized systems, especially stellar disk configurations [8].

This scenario has led many authors, over the years, to investigate MRI in some different contexts and deepening its different morphologies, see for instance [9–14]. A rather general result has been achieved in [15], where

a stratified and differentially rotating disk has been addressed in view of tracing the feature of MRI as a general property of axially symmetric profiles. The very surprising feature derived in this work consists of the independence of the stability conditions on the intensity and direction of the background magnetic field. The aim of the present analysis is to demonstrate how the direction of the magnetic field is actually involved in the stability of the stratified disk, as soon as the so-called co-rotation theorem is taken into account [16]. Such a theorem states that, for a steady, axially symmetric and purely rotating background (exactly the adopted hypotheses in [15]), the disk angular velocity depends on the magnetic flux function only: in what follows, this will be equivalently formulated as the orthogonality character of the angular velocity gradient with respect to the background magnetic field.

Here, we perform the linear perturbation analysis by accounting for the co-rotation profile of the background and then we demonstrate that the obtained dispersion relation takes the same form as the one in [15], but after the orthogonality constraint between the background magnetic field and the angular velocity gradient is imposed. Then we investigate how such a revised dispersion relation affects the stability properties of the stratified disk. The main merit of the present study consists of re-introducing a dependence of the stable profile on the angle that the background magnetic field forms with the entropy gradient, *i.e.* the stability region depends on the direction of the stationary magnetic configuration.

A specific example is considered of a stratified disk around a compact massive astrophysical object, showing how a relevant stability region exists in the inner thick part of the disk.

The basic theoretical framework of the present discussion is the ideal Magneto-hydrodynamics (MHD) theory, as viewed in axial symmetry, *i.e.* reducing the dynamical problem to a two-dimensional one. In particular, in what follows, we will implement the momentum conservation equation

*Electronic address: francesco.cianfrani@ift.uni.wroc.pl

†Electronic address: giovanni.montani@enea.it

$$\rho \left(\partial_t \vec{v} + \vec{v} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \vec{v} \right) = -\vec{\nabla} p + \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{B} \right) \wedge \vec{B}. \quad (1)$$

and the induction equation

$$\partial_t \vec{B} = \vec{\nabla} \wedge \left(\vec{v} \wedge \vec{B} \right), \quad (2)$$

where $\vec{v}$ and $\vec{B}$ denote the velocity and magnetic fields, respectively, while ρ is the plasma mass density and p its total pressure.

The ideal (hydrogen-like) plasma thermodynamics is regulated by the mass and entropy conservation equations, which read respectively

$$\partial_t \rho + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\left(\partial_t + \vec{v} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \right) \ln \left(p \rho^{-5/3} \right) = 0. \quad (4)$$

According to the axial symmetry, in what follows we adopt standard cylindrical coordinates (r, ϕ, z) and we take both the background (denoted by a suffix 0) and the perturbed (characterized by a corresponding suffix 1) quantities as independent of the angle ϕ , while the former are also stationary (independent of the time variable t). More specifically, the background equilibrium is guaranteed by the simultaneous validity of the gravito-static equilibrium and the Lorentz force-free condition, *i.e.*

$$\vec{\nabla} p_0 = \rho_0 \left(\omega_0^2 r \hat{e}_r - \omega_K^2 \hat{r}_p \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\left(\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{B}_0 \right) \wedge \vec{B}_0 = 0, \quad (6)$$

where ω_0 is the background disk angular velocity, ω_K the Keplerian angular velocity and we adopt a compact notation for the poloidal vector radius (*i.e.* $\hat{r}_p = (r, 0, z)$). We consider separately the force-free condition, because we regard the background field $\vec{B}_0$ as the radiation one, due to the central star. Furthermore, the basic co-rotation condition must hold

$$\vec{B}_0 \cdot \vec{\nabla} \omega_0 = 0. \quad (7)$$

The linear perturbation theory is faced in the local approximation limit, when the wavelength of the disturbances is much less than the typical scale of variation characterizing the background, *i.e.* we will deal with the condition $|\vec{k}| |\vec{r}_p| \gg 1$ ($\vec{k}$ being the wave vector used below). Such assumption allows to treat the background variables as parametric quantities and the Fourier analysis is available.

Finally, we will adopt also the so-called Boussinesq approximation [5], which reduces the mass conservation equation to the local incompressibility of the perturbations, *i.e.* equation (3) becomes the constraint $\vec{k} \cdot \vec{v}_{p1} = 0$,

where $\vec{v}_{p1}$ denotes the poloidal perturbed velocity. This assumption corresponds to require that the sound speed is much greater than the Alfvén one and therefore the plasma β -parameter is large. The study of the perturbation dynamics does not require, as we shall see, the specification of the equation of state, relating p_1 and ρ_1 , since the perturbed pressure will be provided by requiring the validity of the local incompressibility during the plasma evolution. The resulting expression for p_1 , for sufficiently large wavenumbers, results to be negligible in equation (4), which de facto becomes a link between ρ_1 and $\vec{v}_{p1}$.

II. LINEAR APPROXIMATION

Let us consider the case of axisymmetric perturbations, with a poloidal wave-vector $\vec{k} = (k_r, 0, k_z)$. The basic equations from which we start are the perturbed poloidal and azimuthal components of the momentum conservation equation (1) and of the induction equation (2) in the linear approximation, which read

$$\Omega \vec{v}_{1p} - 2i\omega_0 v_{\phi 1} \vec{e}_r - \frac{\vec{k}}{\rho_0} p_1 - i \frac{\vec{\nabla} p_0}{\rho_0^2} \rho_1 - \frac{1}{4\pi\rho_0} \left(\vec{B}_0 \cdot \vec{B}_1 \vec{k} - \vec{k} \cdot \vec{B}_0 \vec{B}_{1p} \right) = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\Omega v_{\phi 1} + ir \vec{v}_{1p} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \omega_0 + 2i\omega_0 v_{1pr} + \frac{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{B}_0}{4\pi\rho_0} B_{\phi 1} = 0 \quad (9)$$

and

$$\Omega \vec{B}_{1p} + \vec{k} \cdot \vec{B}_0 \vec{v}_{1p} = 0 \quad (10)$$

$$\Omega B_{\phi 1} - ir \vec{B}_1 \cdot \vec{\nabla} \omega_0 + \vec{k} \cdot \vec{B}_0 v_{\phi 1} = 0, \quad (11)$$

respectively.

From (10) and (11) the components $\vec{B}_{1p}$ and $B_{\phi 1}$ of the magnetic field can be written in terms of other variables and the resulting expressions can be inserted into (8) (9). An expression for the perturbed pressure p_1 can be given by multiplying (8) times $\vec{k}$ and using the mass conservation equation in the Boussinesq approximation, namely $\vec{k} \cdot \vec{v}_{p1} = 0$, which must be preserved during the dynamics. Eventually, the perturbed mass density can be given from the entropy conservation equation (4), which written for adiabatic perturbations, in the limit when $p_1/p_0 \ll \rho_1/\rho_0$ (which is easy to realize accounting for the large value of k in the local approximation scheme), reduces to the form

$$i\Omega \frac{5}{3} \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0} + \vec{v}_{1p} \cdot \vec{C}_0 = 0, \quad (12)$$

where $\vec{C}_0 \equiv \vec{\nabla} \ln \left(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3} \right)$.

The dispersion relation can be given by combining the conditions one gets from (8) and (9) after all these manipulations and by considering the following decomposition for the wave vector: since, by virtue of the co-rotation theorem (7), the two vector $\vec{B}_0$ and $\vec{\nabla}\omega_0$ are orthogonal and the wavevector $\vec{k}$ has zero azimuthal component (the perturbations preserve axial symmetry), we can write

$$\vec{k} = k_{\parallel} \frac{\vec{B}_0}{|\vec{B}_0|} + k_{\perp} \frac{\vec{\nabla}\omega_0}{|\vec{\nabla}\omega_0|}, \quad (13)$$

or more explicitly

$$k_r = k_{\parallel} \cos \beta + k_{\perp} \sin \beta, \quad k_z = -k_{\parallel} \sin \beta + k_{\perp} \cos \beta, \quad (14)$$

with $0 \leq \beta < 2\pi$ being the angle between the background magnetic field and the equatorial plane.

The final dispersion relation is

$$\tilde{\Omega}^6 + A\tilde{\Omega}^4 + B\tilde{\Omega}^2 + C = 0, \quad (15)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{3}{5} \left(\frac{\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{C}_0}{\rho_0} - \frac{(\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{k})(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{C}_0)}{k^2 \rho_0} \right) - y_m \frac{k_{\parallel}^2}{k^2} \sin \beta \\ &\quad + y_m \frac{k_{\parallel} k_{\perp}}{k^2} \cos \beta - 4\omega_0^2 \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \\ B &= -\frac{3}{5} \left(y_m \frac{k_{\parallel}^2}{k^2} \sin \beta - y_m \frac{k_{\parallel} k_{\perp}}{k^2} \cos \beta + 4\omega_0^2 \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \right) \\ &\quad \left(\frac{\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{C}_0}{\rho_0} - \frac{(\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{k})(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{C}_0)}{k^2 \rho_0} \right) - 4\omega_A^2 \omega_0^2 \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{6}{5} \omega_0 \left[\left(\frac{r \vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega_0}{\rho_0} \frac{k_{\parallel}^2}{k^2} - \frac{r \partial_{\parallel} p_0}{\rho_0} |\vec{\nabla}\omega_0| \frac{k_{\parallel} k_{\perp}}{k^2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\omega_0 \left(\frac{\partial_r p_0}{\rho_0} \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} - \frac{\partial_z p_0}{\rho_0} \frac{k_r k_z}{k^2} \right) \right] \\ &\quad \left(C_{0r} \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} - C_{0z} \frac{k_r k_z}{k^2} \right) \\ C &= \frac{12}{5} \omega_A^2 \omega_0^2 \left[-\frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \left(\frac{\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{C}_0}{\rho_0} - \frac{(\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{k})(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{C}_0)}{k^2 \rho_0} \right) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(C_{0r} \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} - C_{0z} \frac{k_r k_z}{k^2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial_r p_0}{\rho_0} \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} - \frac{\partial_z p_0}{\rho_0} \frac{k_r k_z}{k^2} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Above, we defined the quantities $\omega_A^2 \equiv \frac{(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{B}_0)^2}{4\pi \rho_0}$, $\tilde{\Omega}^2 = \Omega^2 - \omega_A^2$ and $y_m = 2\omega_0 r |\vec{\nabla}\omega_0|$.

If as in [15] one introduces

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{k_r}{k_z} \partial_z - \partial_r, \quad (19)$$

it can be shown that

$$C_{0r} \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} - C_{0z} \frac{k_r k_z}{k^2} = -\frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \mathcal{D} \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}) \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{C}_0}{\rho_0} - \frac{(\vec{\nabla}p_0 \cdot \vec{k})(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{C}_0)}{k^2 \rho_0} = \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \frac{\mathcal{D} p_0}{\rho_0} \mathcal{D} \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}) \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{\partial_r p_0}{\rho_0} \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} - \frac{\partial_z p_0}{\rho_0} \frac{k_r k_z}{k^2} = -\frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \frac{\mathcal{D} p_0}{\rho_0} \quad (22)$$

from which it follows that $C = 0$.

Moreover, the following relation holds for the second term on the right-hand side of (16)

$$-y_m \frac{k_{\parallel}^2}{k^2} \sin \beta + y_m \frac{k_{\parallel} k_{\perp}}{k^2} \cos \beta - 4\omega_0^2 \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} = \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \frac{1}{r^3} \mathcal{D}(\omega_0^2 r^4). \quad (23)$$

Similarly, using (20), (21) and (23) also the expression (17) for B can be simplified. Collecting all these results, we end up with the following expressions

$$A = \left[\frac{3}{5} \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \mathcal{D} \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}) \frac{\mathcal{D} p_0}{\rho_0} + \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \frac{1}{r^3} \mathcal{D}(\omega_0^2 r^4) \right] \Big|_{cr} \quad (24)$$

$$B = \left[-4\omega_A^2 \omega_0^2 \frac{k_z^2}{k^2} \right] \Big|_{cr} \quad (25)$$

$$C = 0, \quad (26)$$

where $|_{cr}$ means the imposition of the co-rotation theorem, *i.e.* the decomposition (13) for $\vec{k}$. The resulting dispersion relation formally coincides with that given by Balbus in [15], but for the implementation of the corotation theorem.

Similarly, the study of the stability can be performed as in [15]: the stability condition can be translated into the condition that the dispersion relation (15) does not admit solutions in the limit $\Omega \rightarrow 0$, which implies the following inequality

$$x^2 N_z^2 + x \left[\frac{3}{5\omega_0} \left(\partial_z p_0 \partial_r \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}) + \partial_r p_0 \partial_z \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}) \right) - r \partial_z \omega_0^2 \right] + N_r^2 + r \partial_r \omega_0^2 > 0, \quad (27)$$

where

$$x = \frac{k_r}{k_z}, \quad N_i^2 = -\frac{3}{5\omega_0} \partial_i p_0 \partial_i \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}). \quad (28)$$

The inequality above is always verified if [20]

$$N_z^2 > 0 \quad (29)$$

$$-\partial_z p_0 \left[\partial_r \omega_0^2 \partial_z \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}) - \partial_z \omega_0^2 \partial_r \ln(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3}) \right] > 0. \quad (30)$$

The imposition of the co-rotation theorem here means that the derivatives of ω_0 must be written according to the following relations

$$r \partial_r \omega_0^2 = y_m \sin \beta \quad r \partial_z \omega_0^2 = y_m \cos \beta, \quad (31)$$

which come from the decomposition of the radial and vertical directions as in (13). Therefore, the stability condition (30) becomes

$$-y_m \partial_z p_0 \left[\sin \beta \partial_z \ln \left(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3} \right) - \cos \beta \partial_r \ln \left(p_0 \rho_0^{-5/3} \right) \right] > 0, \quad (32)$$

which can be rewritten as follows

$$-y_m \partial_z p_0 \left(\vec{B}_0 \cdot \vec{C}_0 \right) > 0. \quad (33)$$

This relation outlines how for a given matter configuration, *i.e.* given ρ_0 and p_0 , the stability of the system depends on the direction of the magnetic field.

III. RELEVANT APPLICATION

Let us consider as an application of the previous analysis the case of a specific background morphology, describing a stratified (thick) accretion disk around a compact astrophysical object. According to equations (5), the background magnetic field is essentially that generated by the central object and it is here modeled by a dipole-like configuration (a reliable approximation for many concrete astrophysical systems), *i.e.* it is determined by the function $\psi = \frac{\mu_0 r^2}{(r^2 + z^2)^{3/2}}$, where the constant μ_0 fixes the magnetic field amplitude, and it leads to the following magnetic fields components

$$\vec{B} = \vec{\nabla} \wedge \left(\frac{\psi}{r} \right) \hat{e}_\phi = \frac{\mu_0}{(r^2 + z^2)^{5/2}} (3rz, 0, 2z^2 - r^2). \quad (34)$$

The gradients of the pressure can be inferred from (5), by assuming $\omega_0^2 = GM r^6 / (r^2 + z^2)^{9/2}$, M being the mass of the central object. This assumption comes from implementing the co-rotation theorem and requiring that on the equatorial plane the angular velocity be Keplerian [18]. By investigating the consistency conditions coming from (5), it turns out that the matter density is the product of $(r^2 + z^2)^{9/2}$ times an arbitrary function of $r^8 - (r^2 + z^2)^4$, while the pressure equals the primitive of such arbitrary function modulo a constant. We choose an exponential function, leading to the following particular configuration

$$\rho_0 = K (r^2 + z^2)^{9/2} e^{\frac{r^8 - (r^2 + z^2)^4}{\ell^8}}, \quad p_0 = K \ell^8 e^{\frac{r^8 - (r^2 + z^2)^4}{\ell^8}}, \quad (35)$$

K and ℓ being two integration constants. It is easy to check that these expressions solve (5), as it comes by direct substitution. The corresponding profile is characterized by an exponential decay along z , with a decreasing decay length along the radial direction (see figure 1).

The stability condition (29) can be shown to be already contained into (32), such that the stable region is solely determined by the direction of the magnetic field according to (33) (it is drawn in figure 1). This is clarified in figure 2: in the stable region the angle between the magnetic field and the entropy gradient is acute, while in the unstable region it is obtuse.




FIG. 1: The stable region of the system, denoted by the crossed area, is compared with its decay length, represented by the solid line. It is worth noting how the stable region comprises some areas in which the matter density is not negligible in the thick region of the disk.

This analysis outlines how the relative orientation of the magnetic field with respect to the entropy gradient is crucial for the stability of the whole system. In particular, for the considered configuration MRI is suppressed close to the central object in the inner part of the stratified disk (in correspondence to the lobes in figure 1) and therefore no turbulent transport can easily emerge there.




FIG. 2: The magnetic field and the entropy gradient, denoted by black and grey vectors, respectively, are evaluated near the boundary between the stable and unstable regions. In particular, the angle between them is acute/obtuse in the stable/unstable region.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We developed a perturbation analysis which accounts for the validity of the corotation theorem on the background disk configuration, here translated as the orthogonality of the background magnetic field and the angular velocity gradients. The effect of such a restriction on the dispersion relation corresponds to restore a dependence on the background magnetic field direction into the mode spectrum (absent in [15]). Such an effect is relevant only for a stratified plasma disk since, when the z -dependence is weak or removed (like in a thin disk morphology), the corotation constraint is automatically satisfied: the magnetic field is mainly vertical and the angular velocity gradient is essentially radially directed.

We have seen how, in a specific sample, the restored magnetic field dependence leads to a significant modification of the MRI morphology across the disk, since a threshold angle emerges. In fact, MRI can develop only when the angle between the magnetic field and the entropy gradient of the background configuration is bigger than $\pi/2$.

From an astrophysical point of view, the obtained re-

sult could affect the transport properties of thick stratified disks, since in some regions of the plasma profile the turbulent flow due to MRI is clearly suppressed (as elucidated in the previous section), together with the associated effective viscosity. This feature is particularly enhanced far from the equatorial plane (when also the dipole magnetic field is significantly inclined) and for stiff radial pressure gradients, *i.e.* when the disk rotation deviates from the Keplerian behavior [19].

Independently from the astrophysical range of applicability for the corotation theorem (for a discussion see [14]), the present study removes the surprising and, a bit unnatural, feature discussed in [15], about the independence of MRI spectrum on the magnetic configuration, *i.e.* on its own trigger mechanism: actually the magnetic field direction enters the spectrum and also a forbidden spatial region for MRI emerges.

Acknowledgements

This work has been developed in the framework of the CGW Collaboration (www.cgwcollaboration.it).

-
- [1] Velikhov E. P. 1959, Sov. Phys. JETP, **86**, 1398
 - [2] Chandrasekhar S. 1960, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., **46**, 253
 - [3] Shakura N. I. 1973, Soviet Astronomy, **16**, 756
 - [4] Shakura N. I. & Sunyaev R. A. 1973, aap, **24**, 337
 - [5] Balbus S. A. & Hawley J. F. 1998, Rev. Mod. Phys., **70**, 1
 - [6] Balbus S. A. 2003, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **41**, 555
 - [7] Balbus S. A. & Hawley J. F. 1991, Astrophys. J. , **376**, 214
 - [8] Bisnovatyi-Kogan G. S. & Lovelace R. V. E. 2001, New Astronomy Review, **45**, 663
 - [9] Sano T., Miyama S., 1999, ApJ, **515**, 776
 - [10] H. t. Ji, J. Goodman and A. Kageyama 2001, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **325**, L1
 - [11] G. Montani and D. Pugliese 2013, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 033101
 - [12] N. I. Shakura and K. A. Postnov 2015, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **448**, no. 4, 3697
 - [13] G. Montani and D. Pugliese 2015, J. Plasma Phys. **81**, 064904
 - [14] G. Montani, F. Cianfrani and D. Pugliese 2016, Astrophys. J. **827**, 24
 - [15] Balbus S. A. 1995, Astrophys. J. , **453**, 380
 - [16] Ferraro V. C. A. 1937, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **97**, 458
 - [17] B. Coppi 1994, *Plasma Phys. Contrl. Fus.* **36**, B107 (1994).
 - [18] G. Montani and R. Benini 2011, Phys. Rev. E **84**, 026406
 - [19] G. I. Ogilvie 1997, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **288**, 63
 - [20] We note that in [15] the first stability condition is different, but the whole set of conditions can be easily shown to be equivalent.